

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100

2  
3  
4  
5

## 7

8  
9  
0

## 21

---

## 11

---

\_\_\_\_\_

- identifying components associated with a first end point in an environment;
- identifying components associated with a second end point in the environment;
- determining whether any of the identified components are associated with both the first end point and the second end point;
- identifying relationships between the first end point, the second end point, and any components associated with both the first end point and the second end point; *and*
- *displaying the relationships by, in part, displaying a social context associated with the first end point and a second context associated with the second end point.*

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Isaacs discloses all the subject matter of this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that Isaacs fails to disclose all the claimed subject matter. For instance, Isaacs fails to disclose identifying components associated with a first end point and with *a second end point* because, at best, the contacts in Isaacs are only associated with a first end point – that being the user. As such, Isaacs could not possibly disclose “determining whether any of the identified components are associated with both the first end point and the second end point”.

Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, Applicant has amended this claim to recite “displaying the relationships by, in part, displaying a social context associated with the first end point and a second context associated with the second end point.” This subject matter is clearly missing from Isaacs. The Office has recognized this, stating “Isaacs further in view of Martino do not explicitly teach wherein displaying relationships includes displaying a social context associated with the first end point and displaying a social context associated with the second end point.” (Office Action, Page 12).

1 Furthermore, in this regard, the Office's reliance on Fig. 4 of Nevin for disclosing  
2 this subject matter is misplaced because this figure merely shows information  
3 entered for *a single user* ("Rocky"). (see Fig. 4 and Paragraph [0249] of Nevin).  
4 As such, this feature is clearly missing from Nevin as well.

5 Isaacs fails to disclose all the subject matter of this claim. Accordingly,  
6 for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

7 Claims 2-3 and 15 depend from claim 1 and are allowable as depending  
8 from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own  
9 recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 1, are not  
10 disclosed in Isaacs.

11  
12 **The § 102(a) rejections based on Martino**

13 Claims 16, 18, 22-23 and 27-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as  
14 being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,486,897 to Martino et al. (hereinafter  
15 "Martino").

16 Claim 16, as amended [added language in bold italics], recites a method  
17 comprising:

- 18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25
- displaying a first end point;
  - displaying components associated with the first end point;
  - displaying a second end point;
  - displaying components associated with the second end point;
  - displaying a common component associated with the first end point and the second end point;
  - displaying a link between the common component and the first end point; and
  - displaying a link between the common component and the second end point; ***and***

- *determining a path strength associated with the common component by, at least in part,:*
  - *determining a first link strength for the link between the common component and the first end point;*
  - *determining a second link strength for the link between the common component and the second end point; and*
  - *calculating the path strength based at least in part on the first link strength and the second link strength.*

In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Martino discloses all the subject matter of this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that Martino fails to disclose all the claimed subject matter. For instance, Martino fails to disclose displaying a second end point because the display in Fig. 5 of Martino displays a single end point – that being the reference node I7 301.

Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter, Applicant has amended this claim to recite “determining a path strength associated with the common component by, at least in part, determining a first link strength...determining a second link strength...calculating the path strength based at least in part on the first link strength and the second link strength.” This subject matter is clearly missing from Martino.

Martino fails to disclose all the subject matter of this claim. Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

Claims 18 and 22 depend from claim 16 and are allowable as depending from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 16, are not disclosed in Martino.

1        Claim 23, as amended [added language in bold italics], recites one or more  
2 computer-readable *storage* media having stored thereon a computer program that,  
3 when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to:

- 4        • display a first end point in a social network *and a social context*  
5        *associated with the first end point*;
- 6        • display a second end point in a social network *and a social context*  
7        *associated with the second end point*;
- 8        • identify a common component associated with the first end point and  
9        the second end point;
- 10       • display the common component associated with the first end point  
11       and the second end point;
- 12       • display a link between the common component and the first end  
13       point; and
- 14       • display a link between the common component and the second end  
15       point.

16       In making out the rejection of this claim, the Office argues that Martino  
17 discloses all the subject matter of this claim. Applicant respectfully disagrees  
18 and submits that Martino fails to disclose all the claimed subject matter. For  
19 instance, Martino fails to disclose displaying a second end point because the  
20 display in Fig. 5 of Martino displays a single end point – that being the reference  
21 node I7 301.

22       Nevertheless, in the interest of advancing the prosecution of this matter,  
23 Applicant has amended this claim to recite to display “...a social context  
24 associated with the first end point” and “...a social context associated with the  
25 second end point”. This subject matter is clearly missing from Martino.

      Martino fails to disclose all the subject matter of this claim. Accordingly,  
for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

1        Claims 27 and 28 depend from claim 23 and are allowable as depending  
2 from an allowable base claim. These claims are also allowable for their own  
3 recited features which, in combination with those recited in claim 23, are not  
4 disclosed in Martino.

5  
6        **The § 103(a) rejections based on Isaacs and Martino**

7        Claims 4-5, 7-10 and 12-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as  
8 being unpatentable over Isaacs in view of Martino.

9        Claims 4-5, 7, 9, 10 and 12-14 depend from claim 1. In making out the  
10 rejection of these claims, the Office argues Isaacs and Martino teach or suggest all  
11 of the subject matter of these claims and that it would have been obvious to  
12 combine their teachings.

13        Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, Isaacs fails to disclose  
14 all the subject matter of claim 1, including “displaying the relationships, wherein  
15 displaying the relationships includes displaying a social context associated with  
16 the first end point and displaying a social context associated with the second end  
17 point.” Furthermore, Martino fails to remedy this deficiency. As such, Isaacs and  
18 Martino cannot be said to teach or suggest all of the subject matter of these  
19 dependant claims, either singly or in combination. Accordingly, for at least this  
20 reason, these claims are allowable.

21        Claim 8 is Canceled.  
22  
23  
24  
25

1       **The § 103(a) rejections based on Isaacs, Martino and Nevin**

2       Claims 6 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being  
3       unpatentable over Isaacs in view of Martino and further in view of U.S. Patent  
4       Publication No. 2005/0086238 to Nevin, III (hereinafter “Nevin”).

5       Claim 6 depends from claim 1. In making out the rejection of this claim,  
6       the Office argues Isaacs, Martino and Nevin teach or suggest all of the subject  
7       matter of this claim and that it would have been obvious to combine their  
8       teachings.

9       Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, Isaacs fails to disclose  
10      all the subject matter of claim 1, including “displaying the relationships, wherein  
11      displaying the relationships includes displaying a social context associated with  
12      the first end point and displaying a social context associated with the second end  
13      point.” Furthermore, as noted above, Martino and Nevin fail to remedy this  
14      deficiency. As such, Isaacs, Martino and Nevin cannot be said to teach or suggest  
15      all of the subject matter of dependant claim 6, either singly or in combination.  
16      Accordingly, for at least this reason, this claim is allowable.

17      Claim 11 is Canceled.

18  
19      **The § 103(a) rejections based on Martino and Nevin**

20      Claims 17, 19-21 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as  
21      being unpatentable over Martino in view of Nevin.

22      Claims 17 and 19-21 depend from claim 16. In making out the rejection of  
23      these claims, the Office argues Martino and Nevin teach or suggest all of the  
24      subject matter of these claims and that it would have been obvious to combine  
25      their teachings.

1 Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, Martino fails to disclose  
2 all the subject matter of claim 16, including “determining a path strength  
3 associated with the common component, wherein determining a path strength  
4 comprises... determining a first link strength...determining a second link  
5 strength...calculating the path strength based at least in part on the first link  
6 strength and the second link strength.” Furthermore, Nevin fails to remedy this  
7 deficiency. As such, Martino and Nevin cannot be said to teach or suggest all of  
8 the subject matter of these dependant claims, either singly or in combination.  
9 Accordingly, for at least this reason, these claims are allowable.

10 Claims 24-26 depend from claim 23. In making out the rejection of these  
11 claims, the Office argues Martino and Nevin teach or suggest all of the subject  
12 matter of these claims and that it would have been obvious to combine their  
13 teachings.

14 Applicant respectfully disagrees. As noted above, Martino fails to disclose  
15 all the subject matter of claim 23, including to display “...a social context  
16 associated with the first end point” and “...a social context associated with the  
17 second end point”. Furthermore, Nevin fails to remedy this deficiency. As such,  
18 Martino and Nevin cannot be said to teach or suggest all of the subject matter of  
19 these dependant claims, either singly or in combination. Accordingly, for at least  
20 this reason, these claims are allowable.

21  
22  
23  
24  
25



1        **Conclusion**

2        All of the claims are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant  
3 requests a Notice of Allowability be issued forthwith. If the Office's next  
4 anticipated action is to be anything other than issuance of a Notice of Allowability,  
5 Applicant respectfully requests a telephone call from the Examiner.

6  
7  
8        Respectfully Submitted,

9  
10       Dated: 8/6/2007

11       By: 

12       Rich Bucher  
13       Reg. No. 57,971  
14       (509) 324-9256  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25